



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

1/1

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|--|-------------|-------------------------|---------------------|------------------|
| 09/751,748 | 12/29/2000 | Lawrence Henry Hudepohl | MIPS:0107.00US | 7126 |
| 23669 | 7590 | 02/08/2006 | EXAMINER | |
| HUFFMAN LAW GROUP, P.C. 1832 N. CASCADE AVE. COLORADO SPRINGS, CO 80907-7449 | | | TREAT, WILLIAM M | |
| | | ART UNIT | PAPER NUMBER | |
| | | 2181 | | |
| DATE MAILED: 02/08/2006 | | | | |

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

| | | |
|---|------------------|-----------------|
| Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary | Application No. | Applicant(s) |
| | 09/751,748 | HUDEPOHL ET AL. |
| | Examiner | Art Unit |
| | William M. Treat | 2181 |

All Participants:

(1) William M. Treat.

Status of Application: _____

(3) _____.

(2) James W. Huffman.

(4) _____.

Date of Interview: 17 January 2006

Time: _____

Type of Interview:

Telephonic
 Video Conference
 Personal (Copy given to: Applicant Applicant's representative)

Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: Yes No

If Yes, provide a brief description:

Part I.

Rejection(s) discussed:

none

Claims discussed:

none

Prior art documents discussed:

Missing 1449

Part II.

SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:

See Continuation Sheet

Part III.

It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.
 It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.



(Examiner/SPE Signature)

WILLIAM M. TREAT
PRIMARY EXAMINER

(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: The examiner phoned applicants' representative in response to an earlier phone message. The applicants' representative reported that an IDS which had been submitted on 5/25/2005, prior to the examiner's notice of allowance, was not one of the 1449's returned by the examiner. The examiner apologized for the oversight and after looking at the eDAN file again found the 1449 without copies of the non-patent literature. The examiner requested that he be faxed copies of the NPL to his personal fax number to expedite matters. The examiner is still uncertain as to whether the missing 1449 was a malfunction in eDAN or a failure of the contractor to scan the information in a timely manner though he suspects the latter. The examiner is of this opinion because the NPL documents have magically appeared in eDAN though he is certain they were not present when he talked with applicants' representative. Attached are a copy of the reviewed 1449 and a PTOL-90 with the examiner's comments related to the art.



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
U.S. Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

| APPLICATION NO./ CONTROL NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR / PATENT IN REEXAMINATION | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. |
|---------------------------------|-------------|---|---------------------|
|---------------------------------|-------------|---|---------------------|

EXAMINER

ART UNIT PAPER

20060126

DATE MAILED:

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Commissioner for Patents

The examiner found much of the functionality necessary for applicants' invention, such as multiple instruction-busy signals and dual instruction issue, present in the Opal Coprocessor Interface. However, the reference was silent as to what occurred, for example, in the dual instruction issue case when one of the two instructions was blocked by a relevant busy signal.

W M. T

WILLIAM M. TREAT
PRIMARY EXAMINER